

Inspector Committee
DSA Advisory Board
Minutes of Meeting
Thursday, August 12, 2004

California Community Colleges Building
1102 Q Street, 5th Floor, Conference Room A
Sacramento, California

Committee Members Present

Dennis Shallenberger, Chair
Gino Bastianon
Paul Beyl
Kennith Hall
Dave Karina
Art Ross
Jim Ward

Committee Members Absent

Stephanie Gonos, Vice Chair
Tom Shih

DSA Staff Present

Mary Ann Aguayo
John Baca
Dennis Bellet
Jeff Enzler
Eric France
Susan Georgis
Conrad Lewis
Dan Rasmussen
Elena Tarailo
Ronna Taylor
Erika Zepeda

Others Present

Sandy Pringle, Pringle Associates
Frank Sand, Team Inspection

I. Call to Order and Introductions

Committee Chair Dennis Shallenberger called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m. and participants took turns introducing themselves.

Mr. Shallenberger said the Inspector Committee was formed about two years ago to address two broad issues, how DSA should deal with the short-term inspector shortage, and long-term improvements. Committee members edited a list of suggestions from 23 items (proposed draft dated 10/2/04 by Dennis Shallenberger) to 15 items (10/2 document revised during the 10/10/02 meeting; revised document dated 10/15/04). The purpose of the list was to begin addressing the short-term inspector shortage during the October 2002 committee meeting. The list was then presented to the DSA Advisory Board during the December 2002 quarterly meeting. Shortly thereafter, committee meetings were temporarily suspended due to the state's budget crisis. The committee reconvened in March 2004 and discussed its plans for the future.

Mr. Shallenberger said that once the committee began looking at long-term issues at their meeting last March, they realized the importance of first learning what DSA was doing before the committee began developing its recommendations. As a result, Mr. Jeff Enzler and Mr. Conrad Lewis have been asked to provide an overview of DSA's current inspector program during today's meeting.

Mr. Shallenberger reported that at their March 9 meeting the committee accomplished three things: First, he noted they adopted a broad mission statement for the committee. Second,

FINAL IC Minutes of 8/12/04

1 they decided not to make recommendations on forecasting DSA's workload. Third, the
2 committee approved a recommendation to the DSA Advisory Board to accept OSHPD
3 Class A inspectors as DSA Class 2 inspectors, and to consider OSHPD Class B inspectors
4 eligible for DSA Class 3 or Class 4, provided they meet DSA's experience requirements.

5
6 Mr. Shallenberger noted the committee's recommendation was presented to the DSA
7 Advisory Board at the March 19 meeting. He asked if DSA technical staff followed up on
8 this matter. Mr. Lewis responded that the issue of OSHPD inspectors will be addressed as
9 part of a later agenda item.

10
11 Mr. Shallenberger suggested a mechanism for tracking recommendations made to the
12 Board would be helpful and stated that important ideas such as the committee's list of
13 short-term items could be lost if there's no system for following up. Ms. Mary Ann Aguayo
14 noted staff is developing a data base to track motions and follow up items.

15
16 Ms. Elena Tarailo described the process for motions and follow up items. At the quarterly
17 board meeting the committee chair provides the board with the committee meeting report
18 which includes the committee's recommendations consisting of all motions, or action items,
19 voted on by the committee. The Board then votes to approve the committee chair's report.
20 The Board conveys their recommendations to the State Architect through this approval
21 process. If the State Architect concurs with the board's recommendations, he provides
22 guidance to DSA's technical managers and staff following each Board meeting.

23
24 She noted that motions are bolded in the meeting minutes, and with rare exception, such
25 as when committee meetings are conducted just before a Board meeting, as was the case
26 with the March 9 Inspector Committee meeting and the March 19 Advisory Board meeting,
27 for tracking purposes, motions and action items are summarized at the end of the
28 committee minutes.

29
30 Committee members suggested including an executive summary with bulleted
31 recommendations at the beginning of each set of minutes instead of at the end of the
32 minutes. Mr. Shallenberger asked Ms. Tarailo to provide him with a list of follow-up items
33 after the meeting.

II. Review of Minutes - 3/9/04 Meeting

34
35
36
37 Mr. Shallenberger noted the March 9 meeting minutes were previously approved by the
38 board at its March 19 meeting. He welcomed any additional comments from the members.

39
40 Mr. Jim Ward observed that the committee decided it would be better to have the Policies
41 and Procedures Committee arbitrate appeals regarding inspection issues. Mr.
42 Shallenberger noted that the committee recognized there is an appeal process already in
43 place and added the committee decided to concentrate on broad policy issues rather than
44 specific cases.

III. Draft Recommended Changes to the Project Inspector Exam Process

45
46
47
48 Mr. Lewis said Ms. Ronna Taylor and Ms. Candace Melehani conducted an analysis of
49 DSA's existing inspector exam process to identify possible improvements. He invited
50 Ms. Taylor to discuss their work.

51
52 Ms. Taylor stated they began by assessing the current inspector exam and evaluating the

FINAL IC Minutes of 8/12/04

1 test database structure and accuracy. Then they collected information from regional
2 managers and staff on the inspector exam, looked at the process by which exam questions
3 are extracted from the database, and reviewed test administration. Ms. Taylor said the
4 next step will be to have the draft reviewed and revised by DSA staff and managers.

5
6 Ms. Taylor reviewed the summary of the report provided to the committee. She drew
7 attention to the flowchart at the end showing the steps in the current exam process. She
8 also pointed out the list of questions that were discussed with regional managers and staff.

9
10 Mr. Lewis commented that Ms. Taylor and Ms. Melehani focused on the exam itself. He
11 said another part of the process will be to analyze inspector duties and job requirements in
12 the field, and then that information will be correlated with the inspector exam to make sure
13 applicants are being tested on relevant material. Ms. Taylor noted one of the
14 recommendations in the proposal involves hiring a consultant to validate the test to ensure
15 test questions are appropriate and comply with applicable standards.

16
17 Ms. Taylor reviewed and discussed the 14 recommendations in more detail. She invited
18 committee members to e mail their comments and suggestions on the recommendations to
19 her after the meeting. Mr. Lewis noted the costs of implementing the recommendations
20 have not yet been determined.

21
22 Committee members asked Ms. Taylor to provide them with the unabridged version of the
23 draft proposal after the meeting.

24
25 Mr. Shallenberger noted DSA's first task will be to analyze inspector job duties and create
26 an appropriate exam, and the second piece will be to develop a training program.

27
28 Committee members reviewed the flow chart showing the steps in the current exam
29 process.

30
31 Mr. Shallenberger proposed discussing the recommendations one by one.

32
33 Committee members talked about Recommendation 1, simplifying the qualifications
34 standards and application review process. Mr. Shallenberger recommended that DSA
35 review and clarify the exam acceptance criteria.

36
37 With respect to Recommendation 2, regarding an oral interview, committee members
38 proposed having a panel interview the qualified candidates. Mr. Kenneth Hall
39 recommended that panels be composed of an engineer, a school district representative,
40 and one inspector. Committee members suggested developing a pool of architects willing
41 to serve on interview panels or requiring recommendation letters from architects.

42
43 Committee members discussed Recommendation 3, requiring an evaluation from a DSA
44 field engineer. Mr. Art Ross expressed support for allowing field engineers to veto
45 candidates. Mr. Paul Beyl noted DSA already has an oral interview process when
46 inspectors are hired for specific projects. He pointed out that Class 1 inspectors are
47 responsible for supervising other classes, so they should meet higher standards.

48
49 Mr. Lewis asked if the committee would be willing to "jump" to the disciplinary process and
50 inspector job analysis items on today's agenda.

51
52 Mr. Shallenberger proposed that the disciplinary process for exams be addressed first.

V. DSA Inspector Disciplinary Process for Exams (Out of Order)

Mr. Lewis noted there have been reports from the field that exam candidates are passing around test questions, but the problem is difficult to address because people are generally unwilling to file official complaints. He said he consulted with the State Personnel Board and will draft a letter warning candidates that cheating of any kind will disqualify them. In addition, the application itself will be revised to include this warning.

Mr. Enzler noted DSA already requires applicants to sign a statement that they will not divulge exam questions to others.

VI. Future Issue: DSA Inspector Job Analysis - Detailed Duties Analysis, Training/ Education (Out of Order)

Mr. Lewis said DSA is currently operating under staffing constraints and noted more resources are needed to conduct a detailed job analysis. He noted that once the job analysis is complete, an appropriate exam can be developed. He estimated that the process will take six to eight months.

Committee members thanked Mr. Lewis for the update. Mr. Lewis invited committee members to contact him later if they had any questions or comments and excused himself from the meeting.

V. (cont'd) & VIII. DSA Inspector Disciplinary Process for Exams and Field Operations

Mr. Enzler suggested combining his portion of these two agenda topics. He then distributed copies of a proposed disciplinary process for inspectors.

Mr. Hall observed that the disciplinary process ties in with the job analysis. He noted discipline is difficult to enforce without clearly defined standards.

Mr. Enzler stated that IR A-8 is currently the best description of inspector duties. He noted IR A-8 was last revised in January of 2002. Mr. Enzler said there are seven categories of inspector duties: maintaining a job file, understanding construction documents, continuous inspection of work, keeping detailed records of inspections, communication with appropriate parties, monitoring testing and special inspections, and monitoring assistant inspectors. He added that because of current staffing constraints, DSA field engineers are unable to rate the performance of inspectors.

Mr. Enzler said he was focusing his attention on hiring more people to ease the burden on field engineers. He said DSA is creating a new job classification for that purpose, Construction Supervisor I.

Mr. Shallenberger recommended that committee members review the materials provided by Mr. Enzler and discuss them at the next meeting.

Mr. John Baca pointed out that DSA needs to have some disciplinary process in place in the interim. He requested that the committee endorse the proposal and make more detailed revisions later.

FINAL IC Minutes of 8/12/04

1 Mr. Shallenberger observed that the proposed procedure distinguishes the types of
2 infractions and outlines progressive disciplinary steps.

3
4 Mr. Jim Ward noted that most of the infractions have to do with non-technical problems. He
5 expressed his opinion that misinterpretation of documents and codes should be considered
6 a major infraction rather than a minor infraction.

7
8 Mr. Paul Beyl pointed out that the existing language in the California Administrative Code
9 addresses discipline. Mr. Enzler noted DSA still needs to define the disciplinary process.

10
11 Mr. Ward recommended defining the infractions in greater detail. Mr. Hall cautioned
12 against a "laundry list" approach, suggesting the list of infractions be cited as examples
13 rather than absolutes. He also proposed spelling out the progressive disciplinary steps.

14
15 Mr. Shallenberger requested that Mr. Enzler provide committee members with the
16 unabridged version of the proposed disciplinary process. He suggested that the committee
17 endorse the draft disciplinary process proposed by the staff. Mr. Enzler said he would bring
18 the unabridged version after lunch.

19
20 Mr. Shallenberger recommended that the committee review the unabridged version of the
21 draft disciplinary process and discuss this topic again at the next meeting.

22
23 At 11:47 a.m., the committee recessed for lunch. Mr. Shallenberger reconvened the
24 meeting at 1:00 p.m.

VII. Field Oversight Process Issues (Out of Order)

Current Field Oversight Process

28
29 Mr. Enzler distributed a summary of the current DSA field engineer duties. He offered his
30 opinion that field engineers typically spend more time reviewing reports and closing
31 projects than they should.

Short-Term and Long-Term Enhancements

32
33 Mr. Enzler said DSA wants to expand its field oversight role to include access compliance,
34 fire/life/safety, mechanical/electrical/plumbing, and energy conservation and environmental
35 issues. He said the staff contacted OSHPD and other agencies to learn how they operate,
36 and then developed a proposal for short-term and long-term enhancements for DSA.

37
38
39 Mr. Enzler drew attention to his summary of proposed revisions. He noted a critical first
40 step is to hire people in the new Construction Supervisor I classification. He said these
41 people will assume some of the report reviewing and project closing functions, relieving the
42 field engineers and making them available for other duties. For the long term, DSA
43 proposes to hire a team of specialists to expand DSA's field expertise and visit project sites
44 at certain milestones to monitor the work. Mr. Enzler expressed concern about how this
45 multi-disciplinary approach will work on a practical level.

46
47 Mr. Enzler reviewed Appendix A, a chart showing DSA workload and staffing levels over
48 the past ten years. He pointed out that the dollar volumes and number of projects have
49 increased tremendously, but the number of DSA staff has remained virtually flat.

50
51 Mr. Enzler said Appendix B is a brief review of the OSHPD field oversight program, and
52 Appendix C is a chart comparing OSHPD and DSA. He observed that the OSHPD

FINAL IC Minutes of 8/12/04

1 program is not directly transferable to DSA because of significant differences in the number
2 and type of facilities, number and dollar value of projects, and staffing levels.

3
4 Mr.ENZler expressed his opinion that the best course of action would be for DSA to hire
5 people for the Construction Supervisor I position and develop a comprehensive training
6 program for staff.

7
8 Mr. Hall asked about the impact of the California Performance Review (CPR)
9 recommendations on the future of DSA. Mr.ENZler responded that the CPR proposal calls
10 for a number of agencies, including DSA, OSHPD, Department of Water Resources, and
11 Caltrans, to be consolidated under a new Department of Infrastructure. He said more
12 details are not available at this time, but it will probably take a long time to affect this kind of
13 change. Mr.ENZler noted it will probably take a year or two for the Legislature and
14 Governor to review the CPR report and begin implementing some of the recommendations.

15
16 Mr. Shallenberger said about one year ago he attended an OSHPD Inspection Committee
17 meeting to consider the possibility of combining forces with OSHPD for training,
18 examination, and use of inspectors. The committee noted there are areas of overlap and
19 redundancy, but concluded that it would not be a good idea to join forces at that time. Mr.
20 Shallenberger recommended that both agencies refine their inspection programs before
21 considering a merger.

22
23 Mr.ENZler reported that DSA has developed a duty statement for the Construction
24 Supervisor I position, and the specifications are currently being reviewed by the Human
25 Resources staff. Mr. Beyl asked how many people will be hired, and Mr.ENZler responded
26 that DSA hopes to hire 20 to 30 people within the next two years.

27
28 Mr.ENZler offered to provide committee members with a copy of the qualifications for the
29 Construction Supervisor I position and Mr. Shallenberger suggested reviewing and
30 discussing the qualifications at the next meeting.

31
32 Mr. Ward observed that it may be difficult to coordinate multiple disciplines on a particular
33 project. He noted architects generally bring in their own consultants, but having several
34 experts could be a problem. He added that it was probably a good idea to hire
35 Construction Supervisors, but questioned the need for a multi-disciplinary approach.

36
37 Committee members discussed the pros and cons of a multi-disciplinary approach. They
38 generally agreed that having a two-tiered system in the interim, with Construction
39 Supervisors and Field Engineers, would be beneficial for DSA.

40
41 Mr. Shallenberger proposed revisiting the topic of a multi-disciplinary approach for Field
42 Oversight at the next meeting. He suggested moving on to discuss the laboratory
43 evaluation and acceptance (LEA) program.

IX. Laboratory Evaluation and Acceptance Program

Application and Acceptance Procedures

47
48 Mr. Eric France distributed a summary of DSA's current LEA program. He explained the
49 process, the acceptance criteria, and reasons for suspension of acceptance. Mr. France
50 said DSA will be creating a Web page with links so that labs will be able to access
51 information on DSA's requirements and check on the status of their applications. He
52 welcomed comments and suggestions from the committee.

FINAL IC Minutes of 8/12/04

Mr. Shallenberger talked about his experience with the LEA program and DSA's review of his lab testing facility. He expressed his opinion that four years was too long an interval between site visits. Mr. France said DSA hopes to make more frequent visits to lab facilities in the future.

Mr. Hall drew attention to the second page of Mr. France's handout. He proposed using the numbered list as examples of problems, and clarifying that there may be other reasons for suspensions. Mr. Hall suggested changing "for the following reasons" to "reasons such as."

Mr. Shallenberger recommended defining progressive steps in discipline for the LEA program. He noted minor infractions might warrant a letter, more serious problems might require a letter of reprimand, and flagrant abuses would be reasons for suspension. Mr. Hall suggested changing the first sentence to indicate a range of discipline "up to and including suspension."

Mr. France invited committee members to submit additional comments on the document after the meeting.

Mr. Dennis Bellet noted that Mr. John Vester is working on a document control system to allow DSA to track and archive important documents such as IR's and policy statements.

New Interpretations of Regulations for LEA Program

Mr. France said the LEA procedural document can eventually lead to development of IR's for the LEA program. He welcomed committee input on specific issues, such as what constitutes appropriate field testing, requirements for earthwork testing, nondestructive testing, welding inspection, high-stress bolting, and masonry.

Mr. Beyl expressed his opinion that delivery of samples should be performed by a certified lab rather than the project inspector.

Mr. France noted that DSA requires a showing of proficiency for doing soil and rock testing, and labs are also required to have a licensed geotechnical engineer on staff. For non-destructive testing, DSA looks for conformity with ANSI standards and written procedures.

Mr. Shallenberger added that DSA lacks enforcement authority, which sometimes creates problems in the field. He noted this can be a problem with in-shop welding test inspection.

Mr. David Karina said the code requires continuous inspection, so project inspectors should be making site visits to the labs when tests are being performed.

Mr. France noted DSA plans to develop a series of IR's on these lab and testing issues so they can be included in regulations as part of the next code adoption cycle.

Mr. Shallenberger advocated publishing the IR's on the DSA website.

Mr. Beyl commented that welding inspectors need more training in plan reading, bolting, and other aspects of structural assembly.

Committee members suggested that DSA develop a training and certification program for bolting similar to the one available for masonry.

FINAL IC Minutes of 8/12/04

Mr. Shallenberger asked if a soils engineer that wasn't attached to a lab would be able to do his own nuclear testing or maximum density testing. Mr. France responded that DSA requires affiliation with a certified lab. He added that DSA needs to develop an IR to clarify that issue.

Mr. Shallenberger commended the staff for their hard work on the LEA program. He asked committee members to submit additional comments and suggestions to Mr. France after the meeting.

X. Comments on IR A-8

Mr. Shallenberger noted that committee members had just received copies of IR A-8. He proposed deferring this item to the next meeting to allow time for committee members to review the document.

XI. New Business

There were no items of new business raised by committee members.

XII. Next Meeting Date

Mr. Shallenberger proposed scheduling the next meeting date at the October DSA Advisory Board meeting. He suggested selecting a couple dates and then checking with non-Board members as to their availability.

XIII. Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Ward made a motion that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded by Mr. Beyl, and the Inspector Committee meeting was adjourned at 2:33 p.m.

Follow Up Items:

1. DSA staff is developing a data base to track motions and follow up items.
2. Committee members suggested including an executive summary with bulleted recommendations at the beginning of each set of minutes instead of at the end of the minutes.
3. Mr. Shallenberger asked Ms. Tarailo to provide him with a list of follow-up items after the meeting. (Done via e mail).
4. Ms. Taylor invited committee members to e mail their comments and suggestions on their recommendations to her re: the draft "Project Inspector Exam Process" after the meeting.
5. Committee members asked Ms. Taylor to provide them with the unabridged version of the draft after the meeting. (Done via e mail).
6. (Recommendation 1, draft document): Dennis Shallenberger recommended that DSA review and clarify exam acceptance criteria in the document.
7. (Recommendation 2): a. Have a panel interview qualified applicants for oral interviews. b. develop a pool of architects willing to serve on interview panels or require letters of recommendation letters from architects.
8. (Recommendation 3): Art Ross supported the concept of allowing field engineers to veto candidates. (Paul Beyl noted there is currently an oral interview process for

FINAL IC Minutes of 8/12/04

- 1 special projects).
- 2 9. Mr. Shallenberger recommended that committee members review the materials
- 3 provided by Mr. Enzler regarding the proposed disciplinary process for Inspectors
- 4 and Construction Supervisor I in order to discuss them at the next meeting.
- 5 10. Regarding the disciplinary process, Mr. Ward recommended defining the infractions
- 6 in greater detail. Mr. Hall suggested the list of infractions be cited as examples
- 7 rather than absolutes. He also proposed that the progressive disciplinary steps
- 8 should be "spelled out".
- 9 11. Mr. Shallenberger asked the committee to review the unabridged version of the draft
- 10 disciplinary process and discuss at the next meeting.
- 11 12. Mr. Enzler offered to provide committee members with a copy of the qualifications
- 12 for the Construction Supervisor I position and Mr. Shallenberger suggested
- 13 reviewing and discussing the qualifications at the next meeting.
- 14 13. Mr. Shallenberger proposed that the committee revisit the multi-disciplinary
- 15 approach for Field Oversight at the next meeting.
- 16 14. Mr. Hall proposed using the numbered list on page 2 which summarizes the current
- 17 LEA process as examples of problems, clarifying that there may be other reasons for
- 18 suspensions. Mr. Hall suggested changing "for the following reasons" to "reasons
- 19 such as."
- 20 15. Mr. Shallenberger recommended defining progressive steps in discipline for the LEA
- 21 program, noting minor infractions might warrant a letter, more serious problems
- 22 might require a letter of reprimand, and flagrant abuses would be reasons for
- 23 suspension. Mr. Hall then suggested changing the first sentence to indicate a range
- 24 of discipline "up to and including suspension."
- 25 16. Mr. France invited committee members to submit additional comments on the
- 26 document to him after the meeting.
- 27 17. Mr. Shallenberger advocated publishing the IR's on the DSA website.
- 28 18. It was discussed that DSA needs an IR to clarify nuclear testing or maximum density
- 29 testing criteria.
- 30 19. Discussion on IR A-8 was deferred to the next meeting to allow time for committee
- 31 members to review the document.
- 32
- 33
- 34